

**QUESTIONS GENERATED FROM THE MIAMISBURG CLOSURE PROJECT  
(MCP) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)  
WEEK 3 (August 26-30, 2002)**

133. Reference: General

Question: Can DOE provide the offerors the current earned value status for achieving closure?

Answer: No, the Statement of Work of the current contract is not identical to this RFP.

134. Reference: C.2.3.1 and Exhibit 4 Sections I, II, and III related to the current MMCIC Parcel Transfer Map.

Question: There are several PRS sites shown on the Parcel Transfer Map that are not listed in Exhibit 4. Please provide a list on the status of all PRS sites including those that have been binned as NFA, where remediation has been completed, etc.

Answer: The PRS listings provided in the RFP (Exhibits 1-4) correctly capture the statement of work. Information on all PRSs can be found in the reading rooms.

135. Reference: L.17(e) In reference to the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program (SDBP) and Attachment 4 to Section L.

Question: We are unable to locate or identify the NAICS codes eligible for the 10% price evaluation adjustment at the referenced web addresses [www.sba.gov/sdb](http://www.sba.gov/sdb) and [www.census.gov/epcd/www/naics.html](http://www.census.gov/epcd/www/naics.html). Can DOE provide a more complete address or navigating instructions?

Answer: Another address is [www.arnet.gov/References/sdbadjust\\_link.html](http://www.arnet.gov/References/sdbadjust_link.html). Click on heading and the list will be shown by SIC code.

136. Reference: Section C.2.1.1.2, Property Disposition, paragraphs 2., “....disposition classified equipment and material (see specific facility scope statements) in accordance with....”

Question: Please provide the source and availability of “specific facility scope statements.”

Answer: The use of the phrase “see specific facility scope statements” was used in this paragraph to direct offerors to Exhibits 1 and 2 for information. Detailed classified information will be provided to the successful offeror as discussed in the Pre-proposal Conference.

137. Reference: General

Question: For Operable Unit 1 (OU-1), the ROD was signed in June, 1995. As part of the ROD, a requirement was established to perform a review within 5 years to ensure that the remedy continues to be adequate. Please provide a copy of review so that we can assess the continuing risk associated with the selected remedy.

Answer: The requested document, “CERCLA Five-Year Report for the Operable Unit 1 Remedy at the United States Department of Energy, Miamisburg Environmental Management Project”, is in the CERCLA reading room.

138. Reference: L.22 Questions on Solicitation and Question Response #118

Question: Can the due date for questions regarding this solicitation be changed to August 30, 2002?

Answer: No, the RFP has established the date of September 6, 2002.

139. Reference: Attachment 2, Resume Format

Question: Does DOE require specific references for each project as noted in Attachment 2 or general references for each resume? Or are both required? Is there a target number of references required?

Answer: It is the discretion of the offeror on the number and type of references provided with your resume.

140. Reference RFP Section C, Exhibit 1, "Buildings to be Demolished" lists several PRSs within various buildings. As no information can be found within the RFP concerning PRSs "within the buildings", please provide additional information about each of these PRSs. For instance, Exhibit 1 states that Building #23 has PRS #160 within this building, however, no information is provided concerning PRS #160 nor any PRSs within the site buildings. Will separate On-Scene Coordinator reports be required for final disposition of these PRSs within the buildings?

Answer: Information can be found in the CERCLA reading room pertaining to PRSs within buildings. It was the DOE's intent that the PRSs within buildings would be dispositioned during demolition/transfer. Separate on-scene coordinator reports are not required for each PRS within buildings.

141. RFP Section C.3.2, Radioactive Low Level Waste (LLW)/Low Level Mixed Waste (LLMW) Management, states: "The CO will identify receiver sites for LLW and LLMW." Should this not read "approve" rather than "identify"?

Answer: No, this properly reads "identify".

142. RFP Section L.18 (c) I (a) (7) entitled "Performance-Based Project Organization" requires offerors "approach for managing project performance". Section L.18 (c) I (a) (8) asks for the offeror's "performance-based project management approach to achieve site closure." It is not clear to us how these differ. Please provide additional insight into what material you wish the offerors to provide in response to each stated requirement.

Answer: The DOE believes the requirements in the referenced sections are clear and do not require additional clarification.

143. Reference the SEB website, Administrative References and Links, Capital Equipment by Buildings - identifies a "Book Value" for certain pieces of equipment which totals \$5,056,235.93. Should the new contractor elect to use all or some of this equipment with a book value, will the new contractor be obligated to reimburse BWXTO or the DOE for the stated equipment book value? Or, is this equipment GFE provided to the new contractor at no cost?

Answer: This GFS/I is provided at no cost under the Government Property Clause.

144. Reference to Question #28 of the DOE question response - it is not clear from the answer, the RFP, and the CFR reference whether or not DOE will be the owner of the generated waste. Please clarify.

Answer: The contractor is required to sign waste manifests. The DOE is listed on the RCRA Part B Permit as the owner, the contractor will be listed as the operator.

145. Reference to Question #37 of the DOE question response - please define the allowable contamination limits for debris from contaminated buildings and previously contaminated equipment that would permit free release. In other words, what constitutes "clean" for free release?

Answer: The generic surface contamination guidelines provided in DOE Order 5400.5, "Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment", are applicable to existing structures and equipment. Currently there is no threshold for volumetric radioactive contamination (i.e., subsurface as well as surface). Building debris that is bulk contaminated is disposed of as radioactive waste. Most of the tritium areas are assumed to be bulk contaminated.

146. Reference to Question #41 of the DOE question response - please better define the meaning with an expanded discussion of "target closure date." Are all facilities to be turned over to MMCIC expected to be turned over by that date? Does DOE expect all waste to be shipped off site by that date? Does the landscape grading need to be completed by this date?

Answer: The Target Closure date is September 30, 2006. The requirements for facilities to be turned over to the MMCIC are defined in Section C. Yes. Yes.

147. Recent DOE precedent has either explicitly requested, or permitted, each offeror to submit an Executive Summary as part of the proposal submission. Will DOE accept an Executive Summary as part of this proposal? If yes, will it be page counted? If it will be page counted, will DOE assign a specific number of pages? Will these pages be in addition to the pages already specified in the RFP, or shall the offeror take the pages allocated to the Executive Summary from the 50 pages previously allocated to the Closure Strategy?

Answer: The offerors are strongly encouraged to follow the explicit instructions in Section L.

148. Reference to Questions #59 through #61 of the DOE question response - it is clear that the document (Performance Baseline Overview Summary) was provided for information purposes only. However, its utility to non-incumbent offerors is extremely limited, if not negated, without clear answers to these questions, because without detailed answers the financial data in the reports are of limited use. We respectfully request that DOE reconsider its answer to these questions and provide answers that help level the playing field between non-incumbent offerors and the incumbent contractor team.

Answer: As previously stated, this document was provided for information purposes only. Offerors are required to submit their proposal and their own cost based upon the current RFP requirements.

149. Reference to Question #64 of the DOE question response - it is not clear how the terms and conditions of the two contracts are different. Please clarify the basis of your statement to enable offerors to develop a realistic target cost. Please explain the differences in the terms and conditions between the two contracts relating to the cost differences of \$526 million for the November 2001 baseline and the \$367 million target cost and target fee of this contract.

Answer: There are not two contracts. The \$526 million was BWXTO's estimate that was provided to DOE in their November 2001 proposal. The DOE anticipates the target cost plus target fee will not exceed \$367 million for the requirements stated in this RFP.

